IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

TRUEPOSITION, INC., v.	Plaintiff,)	
LM ERICSSON TELEPHONE COMPA (Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson), QU INC., ALCATEL-LUCENT, S.A., THIR GENERATION PARTNERSHIP PROJ 3GPP, and EUROPEAN TELECOMMU STANDARDS INSTITUTE,	ALCOMM) RD) ECT a/k/a)	CIVIL ACTION 2:11-cv-04574-RFK
	Defendants.))))))	

DECLARATION OF WILLIAM S.D. CRAVENS IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT EUROPEAN TELECOMMUNICATIONS STANDARDS INSTITUTE'S MOTION TO DISMISS

WILLIAM S.D. CRAVENS, ESQ., declares, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, as follows:

- 1. I am counsel for Defendant European Telecommunications Standards Institute ("ETSI"), and I make this Declaration in support of ETSI's Motion to Dismiss the Complaint of plaintiff TruePosition Inc. ("TruePosition") pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1), 12(b)(2), and 12(b)(6) (D.I. 64-1), and in response to TruePosition's Oppositions (D.I. 71 and 72) to that Motion.
- 2. On October 12, 2011, TruePosition served the following requests for discovery concerning personal jurisdiction on ETSI: (1) TruePosition's Requests For Production Of Documents To ETSI Regarding Personal Jurisdiction, dated October 12,

- 2011; and (2) TruePosition's Requests For Admission To ETSI Regarding Personal Jurisdiction, dated October 12, 2011 (collectively, the "Discovery Requests").
- 3. In an October 13, 2011 Letter to John G. Harkins, Esq., counsel for TruePosition, I advised him that the Discovery Requests were improper for at least the following reasons: (1) they improperly seek discovery prior to the parties having met and conferred pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) in violation of Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(d)(1); (2) the Court in this action has not issued any order or instruction allowing jurisdictional discovery; and (3) the Discovery Requests were not served on ETSI pursuant to the Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil or Commercial Matters as required by French Penal Code Law No. 80-538, to which ETSI is subject, and which requires ETSI to otherwise refuse to respond to the Discovery Requests. I further requested that TruePosition withdraw its Discovery Requests for these reasons. A true and correct copy of this letter is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.
- 4. TruePosition refused to withdraw its Discovery Requests, and instead insisted that ETSI formally respond to the Discovery Requests.
- 5. On November 14, 2011, ETSI timely served the following on TruePosition in response to the Discovery Requests: (1) ETSI's Response And Objections To TruePosition's Requests For Production Of Documents To ETSI Regarding Personal Jurisdiction, dated November 14, 2011; and (2) ETSI's Response And Objections To TruePosition's Requests For Admission To ETSI Regarding Personal Jurisdiction, dated November 14, 2011. ETSI served

Case 2:11-cv-04574-RK Document 78-1 Filed 11/15/11 Page 3 of 5

these responses and objections subject to and without prejudice to or waiver of any and all of its

objections to the Discovery Requests, including but not limited to those identified herein.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on November 15, 2011.

/s/ William S.D. Cravens
William S.D. Cravens

3

Exhibit 1

To

Declaration Of William S.D.
Cravens In Support Of Defendant
European Telecommunications
Standards Institute's Motion To Dismiss

BINGHAM

William S.D. Cravens Direct Phone: 202.373.6083 Direct Fax: 202.373.6383 william.cravens@bingham.com

October 13, 2011

VIA EMAIL

John G. Harkins, Jr., Esq. Harkins Cunningham 2800 One Commerce Square 2005 Market Street Philadelphia, PA 19103-7042

Re: TruePosition, Inc. v. LM Ericsson Telephone Company, et al., Case No. 2:11-cv-04574-RK

Dear John:

I am writing to formalize my request during our call this morning that TruePosition withdraw the discovery requests improperly served on ETSI on October 12, 2011. The requests are improper for a number of reasons. First, they are premature under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(d)(1) because the discovery period has not yet begun. Second, jurisdictional discovery as to ETSI is not permitted or appropriate for the reasons set forth in Section III(A) of ETSI's Memorandum of Law in support of its Motion to Dismiss. Third, service of the requests is contrary to French law, to which ETSI is subject. Please let me know whether TruePosition will agree to withdraw the requests.

Sincerely yours,

cc:

William S.D. Cravens

Steven E. Bizar, Esq.

Arman Y. Oruc, Esq.

Robert N. Feltoon, Esq.

Roger G. Brooks, Esq.

A. Stephen Hut, Jr., Esq.

Brian M. Boynton, Esq.

Francis P. Newell, Esq. Stephen W. Armstrong, Esq. Richard S. Taffet, Esq.

Ali M. Stoeppelwerth, Esq.

Peri L. Zelig, Esq.

Hartford Hong Kong London Los Angeles **New York Orange County** San Francisco Santa Monica Silicon Valley

Boston Frankfurt

Tokyo

Washington

Bingham McCutchen LLP 2020 K Street NW

> Washington, DC 20006-1806

T+1.202.373.6000 ÷1.202.373.6001 bingham.com

A/74545806.1